

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/999, 297

Applicant(s)

Pool et al

Examiner

AKERS

Art Unit

2164

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MR. POOL (Applicant)(3) MR. LAGERMAN (ATTN)(2) MR. SUNSTEIN (ATTN)(4) MR. GUPTA (ATTN)Date of Interview 1/3/02(5) MR. LOVE (DIRECTOR TC 2100)(6) MR. MILLIN (SPE 2164)Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:AFFIDAVIT of Pool & BLUSDEL EXECUTE 1/3/02Claim(s) discussed: 1-17

Identification of prior art discussed:

1) Schell & CAHN (Applied in RESECTION)2) 1996 GUIDE TO INTERTERMS (INCO)Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argued that ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD UNDERSTAND THAT "COMMERCIAL MIDDLE" IN AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRANSACTION WOULD HAVE THE MEANING EXPRESSED IN POOL'S AFFIDAVIT (EXECUTED). THE EXAMINER DID NOT ACCEPT THIS LINE OF REASONING. APPLICANT (MR. POOL) & MR. LAGERMAN (ATTN) BOTH STATED THAT THEY KNEW NO ONE PRACTISING APPLICANT'S INVENTION. A PROPOSED CLAIM 21 WAS DRAFTED (ATTACHED) AND WAS AGREED THAT SUCH A CLAIM WOULD BE ALLOWABLE. IT WAS AGREED THAT THE LIMITATION "RUNNING A TRANSACTION PROGRAM ON A COMPUTER SYSTEM SO AS TO INTEGRATE PROCESSES...". THE PRIOR ART OF RECORD DOES NOT TEACH THE PROPOSED CLAIMED PROCESS WITH THIS LIMITATION.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

[Signature] SPE
A.U. 2164
Examiner's signature, if required